UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,144	04/14/2004	Ken Kitamura	82478-6500	7827

21611 7590 08/20/2008

SNELL & WILMER LLP (OC)
600 ANTON BOULEVARD
SUITE 1400
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

EXAMINER	
THERIAULT, STEVEN B	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/20/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/825,144	KITAMURA, KEN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	STEVEN B. THERIAULT	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 March 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *21-25* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *21-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: Amendment filed 03/21/2008.

This action is made final.

2. Claims 21-25 are pending in the case. Claims 20, 24 and 25 are the independent claims. Claims 1-20 have been cancelled.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The "recording medium" is not recited in the specification and therefore it is not clear as to which medium in the specification that the applicant refers to provide support for the claim. The specification refers to a computer readable storage medium but not the term recording medium, as recited in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. **Claims 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Emmerichs et al. (hereinafter Emmerichs) U.S. Patent Pub. No. 20030061482 published Mar. 27, 2003 and filed Aug. 23, 2002, in view of Hoag et al. (hereinafter Hoag) U.S. Patent No. 6114978 filed Jan 14, 1998.**

In regard to **Independent claim 21,** Emmerichs teaches an information processing apparatus used by a plurality of different operators or operator groups, comprising:

- A form display unit a form display unit configured to display one of a first form and a second form that are each composed of a specific item group and a non-specific item group other than the specific item group, the specific item group and the non-specific item group each containing at least one input display item being an input field used for input, the specific item group being provided for use by only a specific operator or operator group, the first form being for displaying the specific item group and the non-specific item group, and the second form being for displaying only the non-specific item group (See Para 0053 and figure 3). Emmerichs teaches a GUI that displays a form that contains information to be processed. Emmerichs teaches the controls can apply to a security controlled web page (See Para 28) and can apply to any suitable function or feature that the customer wants to assign it to. Figure 4, outlines a process that allows the system to assign permissions to a host of controls. Emmerichs teaches the page can also be controlled (See Para 10). Emmerichs also teaches the system uses user profiles to assign permissions to each user and creates groups of users. The system allows any criteria the user desires to create a group and assign it to the software.

- An information acquisition unit configured to acquire information which is input by any of the plurality of different operators or operator groups, through the input display item contained in the form displayed by the form display unit, and make the acquired information visible in the input display item on the displayed form (Emmerichs Para 0031-

0033 and 0054) Emmerichs teaches the user of user profiles and a security system to receive ID information as to whether the user can access the widget. Emmerichs teaches the security module receives the input from the user and determines the security to apply (See Para 74). Emmerichs teaches the system judges the access to a data type, widget or other graphical element by scanning the system rapidly (See Para 0079 and Emmerichs Para 0034 and 0054).

- A display change unit configured to, (a) if the first form for displaying the specific item group and the non-specific item group is being displayed, make the specific item group disappear from the displayed form and thereby display the second form for displaying only the non-specific item group, without changing a position of each item of the non-specific item group and display contents of the input display item, and (b) if the second form for displaying only the non-specific item group is being displayed, make the specific item group appear on the displayed form to thereby display the first form for displaying the specific item group and the non-specific item group with a position of each item of the specific item group and display contents of the input display item in the specific item group being same as when the specific item group was displayed last time, without changing a position of each item of the non-specific item group and display contents of the input display item in the non-specific item group (See Para 0079-0080, Figures 3-11 and 0035-0041) Emmerichs teaches the interface checks to see whether a given user profile or ID can access a widget, field or data type. Emmerichs teaches the widget can display a field and without changing the information can make a checkbox available or a radio button based on the user's security profile. Emmerichs shows the form in figure 3 and form does not change the location of the elements in response to the accessibility by the user. The system can perform the functions after the interface is displayed (See Para 53), which does not require the restart shown in figure 2. Therefore, the last time an object was displayed in its location will be the same place it was before. Emmerichs teaches that the form can be dynamically changed by user input as they access the

different pages and can be toggled as they perform operations in the session (See Para 54-55).

- An application execution unit configured to execute the application using the information displayed in the input display item by the information acquisition unit, when one item in the specific item group is operated by the specific operator or operator group (See Figure 13, 514, 519)

Emmerichs does not expressly teach:

- A switching operation acquisition unit configured to acquire simultaneous pressing of a plurality of keys from a current operator, in a state where the acquired information is visible on the displayed form;

However, Emmerichs suggests that the security permissions can be operated in any type of Microsoft Windows applications, which contain a variety of input type (See Para 58). For Example, Microsoft Windows contains shortcuts that allow the operator to input key functions from the keyboard to operation graphical interface functions. Shortcuts have been implemented in the Microsoft Interface and are well known in the art (See Hoag column 1, lines 14-30, discussion of the prior art). Hoag teaches an example of shortcuts can be assigned globally where a series of key ctrl +alt can be assigned to more then one screen. Hoag teaches the mnemonics can be assigned to a screen function were the assignment is available to the user and the user can decide on function by function basis what key to assign (See column 4, lines 22-30).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, having the teachings of Emmerichs and Hoag in front of them, to modify the windows system of Emmerichs with the mnemonic assignments of Hoag to allow the user to control functions of the interface. The motivation to combine Emmerichs with Hoag comes from the suggestion in Hoag that shortcuts are used to make an application operate a certain function and key combinations provide a variety of interface controls, namely switching screens similarly

to the alt+ tab function in windows that allows a user to switch applications (See column 1, lines 1-30 column 11, lines 5-60)

With respect to **dependent claim 22,** as indicated in the discussion above, Emmerichs in view of Hoag teaches each element of claim 1.
Emmerichs does not teach the keys are the alt key and the Pf1 key. However, this limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Hoag because the user can assign virtually any key combination to a function (See Table 1, column 5 and 6).

With respect to **dependent claim 23,** Emmerichs teaches the information processing apparatus further comprising: a storage unit storing form definition information which defines the form containing the specific item group and the non-specific item group, wherein the display change unit redisplays the form according to the form definition information in a state where a visibility property of the specific item group is set to be invisible if the first form is being displayed, and redisplays the form according to the form definition information in a state where the visibility property of the specific item group is set to be visible if the second form is being displayed. (See Para 0035-0042 and 0053). Emmerichs teaches a form is displayed to the user and when a form was defined as having a property that did not allow a user to access a field can change the field dynamically to allow the field to be accessible to the user (See Para 0078), because Emmerichs teaches the changes can be made while the program executes. Emmerichs teaches that each web page can be controlled by a security control (See Para 10). Emmerichs teaches several controls for displaying the form or making the form invisible to the user (See properties Figures 4-11 and Para 70) where the hide control feature is used to display a web page.

In regard to **Claims 24-25,** claims 24-25 reflect the method and medium comprising computer readable instructions for performing substantially similar subject matter as claim 20, and are rejected along the same rationale.

It is noted that any citation to specific pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re *Heck*, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33,216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re *Lemelson*, 397 F.2d 1006,1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

Conclusion

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 21-25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
U.S. Publication to Cooper et al (20040113949) which teaches a process of assigning roles to a given machine. Cooper shows a bank teller can also be a bank officer and perform both roles on the machine. Cooper shows the user selecting a command (See figure 27) to switch the roles of the user **without** signing off of the machine. By switching roles the system can provide different functions on the display (See figure 10 and 18). Cooper specifically mentions application components are switched based on user role and package displayed on the desktop (See Para 9-10). Cooper teaches a process of hiding desktop components based on role and access privilege (See Para 146,162-163).

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven B. Theriault whose telephone number is (571) 272-5867. The examiner can normally be reached on M, W, F 10:00AM - 8:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Steven B Theriault/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2179